STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: JULY 7-9, 1993

WISCONSIN STATE REPORT

JULY 5, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

Diana Perez, Project Officer
Office of Analysis and Evaluation
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

APPENDIX A - State of Wisconsin Exhibits

WISCONSIN STATE REPORT
Site Visit July 7-9, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name: Client Assistance For Reemployment and Economic Support (CARES)

Start Date: 1989

Completion Date: 1996

Contractor: Deloitte Touche

Transfer From: Florida

Cost:

Actual:	$ 5,200,000 (as of 3/31/93)
Projected:	$ 39,621,423
FNS Share:	$ 11,310,072
FNS %:	28.5%

Number of Users: 2,400 (estimated)

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe:	Hitachi GX/8320
Workstations:	Memorex - 3270 type
Telecommunications Network:	T1 Statewide backbone

System Profile:

Programs:	Food Stamp Program (FSP), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Medicaid

1.0   STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

FSP in the State of Wisconsin is under the responsibility of the Division of Economic Support of the Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS). Wisconsin is a county-administered State with the State-level FSP providing oversight of and direction to field operations controlled by County Boards. The State contracts with the counties for the administration of all public assistance functions.

The State of Wisconsin's Division of Economic Support consists of the following organizations:

- Bureau of Welfare Initiatives
- Bureau of Child Support
- Bureau of Quality Assurance
- Bureau of Employment and Program Operations
- Office of Inspector General
- Bureau of Management and Operations

The Food Stamp Management and Evaluation unit is part of the Bureau of Employment and Program Operations.

Wisconsin is a mixed rural/urban State with a population of 4,906,745 as of the 1990 census. The State contains 72 counties and 5 tribal governments. Wisconsin maintains seven regional offices which each house area directors, quality assurance staff, and other operations. Milwaukee is the largest population center and operates multiple office sites. No local office has a caseload of less than 125 people.

The unemployment rate in Wisconsin declined from 1982 to 1988, with a high of 10.7 percent in 1982 and a low of 4.3 in 1988. The unemployment rate has increased slightly since 1988, reaching 5.4 percent in 1991.

The Fiscal Survey of States, published in October 1992 by the National Governors' Association and National Association of State Budget Officers, presents the following information concerning Wisconsin:

- Wisconsin was one of nine States in the nation which experienced negative expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993.

- Wisconsin did not reduce the 1992 State budget after it was approved.

- State government employment levels in Wisconsin increased by 0.49 percent from FY 1992 to FY 1993.

- Wisconsin increased revenues by $32.9 million, mainly through an expansion of the State tobacco tax.

- The economic outlook for the Great Lakes region is decidedly mixed. Wisconsin's profile, however, was positive, with an unemployment rate below the national average and a job gain of 1.5 percent.

2.0   FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

FSP in Wisconsin is currently supported by the CRN-IMP system which also supports the AFDC and Medicaid. The WIDS-WPRS system supports the work program (JOBS); FOODBACK is a stand-alone claims collection system that interfaces with CRN-IMP. Wisconsin is currently in the midst of developing a replacement system for CRN-IMP. This system, CARES, is a transfer of the Florida adaptation of the Ohio CRIS-E system and will provide eligibility determination for FSP, AFDC, and Medicaid, replacing the CRN-IMP, WIDS-WPRS, and FOODBACK systems.

Hardware and telecommunication facilities are supplied to the CRN-IMP system, and will continue to be supplied to the CARES system, by the Department of Administration, Division of Information Technology.

2.1   Food Stamp Program Participation

FSP household participation increased by almost 23 percent between May 1988 and May 1992. Individual participation in the program increased by 11 percent during this same time period. AFDC has shown decreases for this period amounting to 6.8 percent for families and 7.5 percent for individuals.

FSP participation figures for this time period are shown in Table 2.1 below.[1]

2.2   FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has decreased from 11.8:1 in 1988 to 10.6:1 in 1992.

Wisconsin's average monthly benefit issuance per household had increased until 1992, as shown in Table 2.2.[2]

---

[1] All data supplied by the State of Wisconsin. Data on Foster Care and Child Support was not available. Medicaid numbers are a State estimate and may not reflect true participation. General Assistance is a county-administered program and data is not available at the state level.

[2] The number of households and benefit amounts use data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* for each year.

2.3   FSP Administrative Costs

Wisconsin's FSP administrative costs for the past five years are shown in Table 2.3.[3]

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

Program	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC Cases	81,855	80,789	79,101	80,552	87,817
Individuals	244,685	241,574	236,662	240,156	264,421
Foster Care	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FSP Households	131,136	102,305	98,323	98,748	107,055
Individuals	347,407	298,705	286,714	288,079	312,757
Medicaid	422,000	414,000	408,000	403,000	401,000

Table 2.2   FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	$159.43	$171.92	$153.78	$131.23	$123.54

---

[3] The number of households and FSP Federal administrative costs are derived from data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* each year.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	$22,137,610	$18,763,012	$16,954,351	$15,021,354	$13,532,555
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	$14.97	$15.56	$14.44	$12.58	$10.48

2.4   System Impacts on Program Performance

Wisconsin is a county-administered State, and, as such, the State government has little control over the staffing patterns or internal work flows of the local offices. Contracts between counties and the State are negotiated on a regular basis and funding is provided in accordance with the terms and conditions agreed upon. Changes that arise during the course of the contract, such as system changes, are a source of contention between the State and the counties. Changes which increase the workload of local office employees, especially if the increase is sufficient to warrant additional personnel, may cause problems with county officials because funding from the State or Federal government does not usually change during the term of the contract.

Areas of increased efficiency may, in fact, increase the workload of the line level employee because of the increased information available to them through automated systems.

Areas of Food Stamp Program performance that could potentially be affected by the automated systems that support FSP include:

- Staffing and workloads
- The ability to implement regulatory changes in a timely manner
- The rate of error generation and correction
- Claims collection
- Certification

2.4.1   Staffing

Wisconsin was unable to supply specific data relating the increase or decrease in the number of issuance staff. An increase was reported in the average monthly caseload per eligibility worker over the past five years. The overall number of

caseworkers and other Income Maintenance staff also increased over the same period.

There are currently 358 clerical support workers, 941 full-time equivalents (FTE), and 121 full-time and 31 part-time eligibility worker supervisors employed at the county level. This results in an average caseload 197.5 cases per FTE, given an unduplicated case count of 185,865. All figures are estimates of State-level staff and the degree of accuracy of these figures is unknown. No firm historical figures were available at the time of the study.

Local office operations are under the control of individual counties and assigned duties may vary depending upon the policies and procedures of those specific political entities.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes

As detailed in Exhibit A-2.1 in Appendix A, Wisconsin State staff indicated that only 4 of the 14 Federal regulations cited were implemented within the Federal timelines. Of the ten regulations that were implemented late, two were regarded as being of low priority and three were implemented late due to a lack of qualified staff. The reason for delayed implementation of the remaining regulations was unknown to current staff.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rates

Wisconsin's official combined error rate, which is provided in Table 2.4, fluctuated between 1988 and 1992. The 1992 error rate decreased to 9.32.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	9.32	10.05	11.36	9.84	10.25

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Total claims collected, total claims established, and the percentage of total claims established that were collected, as shown in Table 2.5, fluctuated during the past five years.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	$3,408,934	$2,751,210	$3,792,733	$3,754,992	$3,178,242
Total Claims Collected	$1,919,850	$1,859,876	$1,877,858	$1,544,491	$1,416,748
As a % of Total Claims Established	56.3%	67.6%	49.5%	41.1%	44.5%

Automated systems are able to decrease payment errors and increase collection of inadvertent/fraudulent overpayment due to two capabilities. First, standardization of eligibility determination and benefit calculation ensures that all applicants are treated in the same manner and that the same methodology is used throughout the State. Second, statewide automated systems prevent duplicate participation by individuals by means of automated matching against current and previous participants. This check is intended to prevent clients from applying at more than one local office. In addition, matches against State and Federal databases for wage, benefit, and asset information serve to determine the accuracy of participants' reported income and other eligibility information. Claims usually arise out of these checks against other databases.

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

The basic system currently supporting the Wisconsin Food Stamp Program, CRN-IMP, has been operational for approximately 13 years. It received Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certification in 1983 and has been reviewed by FNS.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

The CARES system was under development during the time of the site visit; specific information concerning its features and functionality are not included in this section. CARES will transfer much of the functionality of the Florida and Ohio CRIS-E type systems. It is an interactive interview model designed to move data entry functions down to the caseworker level and to structure case flow in a much different manner than is currently practiced in Wisconsin. The move of the CRIS-E model from the IMS database to the relational DB2 system will offer

opportunities for additional functional enhancements and provides greater flexibility in data access and increased ease of maintenance. CARES will be implemented in mid-1994.

This section discusses the features of the CRN-IMP and related systems currently supporting the Food Stamp Program in Wisconsin.

3.1 System Functionality

- *Registration*. The Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services's Division of Economic Support utilizes a common, combined application form for Financial Assistance (AFDC), Medical Assistance (Medicaid), and the Food Stamp Program. The applicant must indicate for which program(s) he or she is applying. The system only determines eligibility for any programs indicated. The first part of the form is reviewed by the registration worker to determine if the applicant is eligible for expedited service. If so, a same day interview is scheduled and the applicant completes the remainder of the common application form. If expedited service is not warranted, an interview will be scheduled at a later date.

  Data is entered into the system by data entry operators from the application form. The system saves the entire list of household members, although only the head of household is involved in the search process. Disqualified recipient files are not searched at this time. The Social Security number (SSN) of the head of household is used as the case number. Previous recipients may have their historical records copied into the new case record automatically if the case is less than twelve months old. Clerks are responsible for reviewing potential matches and deciding whether to include these records in the new case.

- *Eligibility Determination* The eligibility worker reviews the completed application with the applicant at the time of the eligibility interview. Data from the completed application is entered into the system by data entry operators after the interview is completed. Data entry screens have the same format and sequence as the pages of the application form and may be by-passed by the data entry operator if data does not need to be entered for that screen. Data entry screens have immediate on-line edits and include on-line calculator screens.

  The CRN-IMP system does not track missing verifications, but does determine the client's eligibility. Background processing of the eligibility determination/benefit calculation and computer matching functions are provided to reduce response time problems at peak workload periods.

- *Benefit Calculation*. The caseworker may verify the benefit calculations; however, formal authorization is not needed within the system, either from the caseworker or the supervisor. This is true regardless of the benefit level, or whether the case is a new or re-applying case.

- **Benefit Issuance.** Wisconsin provides coupon issuance by mail and from itinerant sites. Issuance from itinerant sites is provided for the convenience of migrant farm workers in rural areas. Mail issuance may be via regular or certified mail. Food coupons may be mailed directly to the household or to local county offices for recipient pick-up. All coupons are stuffed into client addressed envelopes at the central office site.

  Regular mail issuance is the norm; certified mail and local office pick-up are used only when undelivered coupons have previously been reported. Clients may request local office pick-up at their discretion. There are no Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) projects planned or in operation at this time.

  Issuance is staggered over a ten-day period based upon the head of household's SSN. Special issuances, including expedited and replacement, are produced daily. Replacement and expedited issuances are possible as soon as the next working day after request by the eligibility worker.

  The centralized mailing function is capable of producing mailing labels and certified documents. It utilizes bar codes generated by the system in order to determine the correct amount and denominations of coupons to be mailed.

- **Notices.** The CRN-IMP system is capable of generating notices based on the following circumstances:

  - Key events related to household participation
  - Key events related to household eligibility
  - Warnings that a monthly report was not received
  - Denial because of failure to keep appointments
  - Eligibility determination results
  - Benefit reductions
  - Benefit increases
  - Application approval
  - Denial based on eligibility determination
  - Closure based on recertification information

  The system generates both automatic and worker-initiated notices. Worker input to the wording of the notice is not permitted.

  Notices are printed and mailed from the central site.

- **Claims System.** The claims system (FOODBACK) is a separate system that is linked to the CRN-IMP eligibility determination system. Data is exchanged daily between the two systems. The FOODBACK system is an interfaced claims and collection system internally developed by State staff. Records of outstanding claims are available on-line and in paper reports, as are records of collected

claims. This system will be replaced by the integrated claims modules of the CARES system when it becomes operational in mid-1994.

Claims are established by eligibility workers who enter information regarding the cause of under/over payments and whether fraud is suspected into the on-line CRN-IMP system. Establishing a claim does not require supervisory approval. The corrected benefit allotment amount is calculated by the system, but the worker can override the system's calculations. Calculations are based on the current rules and regulations in effect at the time of the claim. Calculations for prior periods must be made manually. Automatic notice generation concerning over/under payment is handled by the system as is the creation of a collection record. The collection method is determined by the eligibility worker and does not require supervisory approval.

The system provides an on-line display of the complete collection history and automatically deducts the recoupment amount as part of the issuance process.

- *Computer Matching*. The system can perform on-line matching of applicant data against the State Department of Labor database for both wage and unemployment information at any time during the life of the case. All participants and applicants are matched against the following databases on a regular basis via batch processing:

    - SDX for SSI benefit information
    - IRS for income and asset information
    - BEERS for Social Security Administration (SSA) Wages
    - BENDEX for Social Security Benefits
    - SSA validation of Social Security numbers
    - State income tax records

    Duplicate participation checks are performed in a background mode at the time of initial application, at certification, whenever a new household member is added, and when any change is made in the case.

    Wisconsin utilizes thresholds and targeting schemes in its computer matching operations. All discrepancies are reported to the eligibility worker in the form of monthly reports. Discrepancies are not prioritized. The system does not monitor the progress of the worker in resolving discrepancies. The discrepancies will, however, continue to appear on the printed report until they are resolved.

- *Alerts*. The CRN-IMP system does not provide an on-line alert capability. Printed reports may be generated for use by supervisors and eligibility workers to determine due and past-due actions.

- *Monthly Reporting*. The CRN-IMP system determines the specific cases which are subject to the monthly reporting requirements and produces the monthly report

forms for mailing. It includes the assigned eligibility worker's identification and address information on the return form, generates warning notices to clients whose reports are late, and automatically closes cases for which reports have not been received. The status of specific monthly report forms is indicated on an on-line screen and automatic approval of next month's benefits is possible.

Information regarding the receipt of monthly reporting forms, including changed data, may be entered into the system by eligibility workers, clerical employees, or data entry operators. Which type of employee enters the data depends on the practices in use at the specific local office. Incomplete monthly reports result in an automatic generation of a client notice.

- *Reports*. A weekly case directory of active cases is prepared for each eligibility worker. This report is printed locally.

- *Program Management and Administration*. Electronic mail is available at the local county office level. It is used to disseminate policy changes and for normal correspondence between State and local offices.

  The CRN-IMP does not support on-line policy manuals, though a help function within the system does provide a minimum amount of data on system functions and interactions.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

The CRN-IMP system is one of the earlier FAMIS-type systems and is currently in the process of being replaced by the new CARES system. While it does determine eligibility for the three principal public assistance programs (AFDC, FSP, and Medicaid) it lacks many of the productivity features found on newer systems that support these programs. The system was designed to operate more at the data entry operator level than at the eligibility worker level. It is primarily batch oriented with some limited on-line functionality.

approximately, serve on a part-time basis but may be full-time employees of the county. There is a workstation for each public assistance program worker.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

CRN-IMP, and related systems, are currently in a "hold" status as far as enhancement or changes of any type are concerned. The CARES system is scheduled for implementation in mid-1994 and all available State resources are devoted to this large project rather than to enhancement of the existing system.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section describes the history of the current system and the steps leading up to the CARES project. It covers the planning, development, implementation, conversion approach, project management, and current and future FSP and management information services (MIS) participation.

4.1 Overview of the Current System

The CRN-IMP system has been operational since the early 1980s. CRN-IMP was the first system in the country to be certified under the FAMIS initiative. Certification occurred in 1983. Enhancements to the system have been on-going since that time. These include adding new subsystems and developing systems (WIDS-WPRS, FOODBANK) that interface with the CRN-IMP system. Planning began in 1988 for the development of a new, comprehensive system to replace CRN-IMP. Enhancements to the current system have been slowed since that date in anticipation of the replacement system.

4.2 Justification for the New System

Wisconsin justified developing a system to replace CRN-IMP with the belief that a new system would increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the public assistance program personnel, including eligibility workers and support staff. Other potential benefits of the new system were: increases in claims collection, more timely client eligibility determination and benefit issuance, reductions in the official error rates, and easier maintenance of the technical system.

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

The first Advanced Planning Document (APD) was submitted in November of 1988 and approved by the Federal agencies on January 31, 1989. This planning APD, with five extensions, was in effect until mid-1991 when the Implementation APD was approved. A list of past and present APDs is presented in Table 4.1.[4]

---

[4] All information provided by Wisconsin.

Table 4.1 Wisconsin APD History

APD Document	Date Submitted	Description/ Purpose	Dollar Amount	Approval Date	Funded Amount
WI-89 0000-3-11	11/88	Planning APD	$115,635	1/31/89	$86,726
WI-89 0000-1511	6/89	Extension #1	$365,532	8/2/89	$274,149
WI-89 0000-1511	5/90	Extension #2	-0-	7/1/90	-0-
WI-89 0000-1511	8/90	Extension #3	-0-	10/1/90	-0-
WI-89 0000-1511	1/91	Extension #4	-0-	3/1/91	-0-
WI-89 0000-1511	6/91	Extension #5	$65,239	7/1/91	$48,929
WI-91 0000-1111	5/15/91	IAPD	$11,774,087	4/15/93	$7,417,674
TOTAL DOLLARS			$12,320,493		$7,827,478

A request for proposal (RFP) was developed in February of 1990 which called for the transfer of a Federally certifiable system from another State. A contract was issued to the firm of Deloitte Touche and the Validation of Requirements Phase of the project began on January 2, 1992. System development has begun although there have been some delays. A major delay was caused by difficulty in obtaining the Florida system software documentation. This problem led to delays in the execution of the implementation contractor's contract.

The project schedule, as of January 15, 1992, called for pilot operations to begin July 1, 1993 and last through December 31, 1993. The statewide implementation date was july 1994. As of mid-July 1993, pilot operations had not yet begun.

The original proposal to transfer the Ohio CRIS-E system was changed to designate the Florida system as the transfer donor during contract negotiations. This system will be changed from the IMS database design, used in both Ohio and Florida, to a DB2 design. It is not known what advantages this design change will offer, nor what opportunities and challenges it may represent. A change in databases could have program impacts throughout the system and require extensive code revisions.

4.4 Conversion Approach

Some automated conversion of CRN-IMP data will be performed. This task is combined with JOBS case functions and quality control as Track 6 of the overall project. Training schedules and content will be coordinated with the conversion approach from pilot start-up through full implementation.

A detailed description of the conversion approach that will actually be utilized during statewide implementation is unavailable. Plans have been made, however, for a staged implementation that conform to the methodology common in this area.

4.5 Project Management

The project management plan for the CARES project was published in October 1991. It designates the CARES project director as being responsible for the direct management of the project and designates the project director as the Department's liaison with the contractor, functioning as the contract administrator. Organizationally, the project director holds the position of data systems administrator and reports to the Departmental Secretary's Office. Principal executive oversight is provided by the deputy secretary.

The project director is 100 percent devoted to the management of the project. She was drawn from the program side and has extensive experience in both Program operations and MIS. The project director also states that she has a great deal of experience in project management, with slightly less experience in projects of similar size and scope.

To date, there has been no turnover of key personnel in the project management, contractor director, key program personnel, or key field staff personnel.

The project director believes that organizational, communication, negotiation, analytical, and capacity planning skills are most important in the management of the project. Lesser emphasis was placed on cost estimating, public assistance program knowledge, and programming skills. Project personnel commented on the need to have a balance between program and technical skills.

The project team is attached to the Department Secretary's Office and includes a project manager from the Division of Economic Support and a technical manager from the Division of Management Services, as well as a representative from the quality assurance contractor, Eligibility Management Systems. State-level staff are assigned to the project from both the program and technical areas. Their assignment lasts for the length of the project. Two local agency staff are also assigned to the project on a temporary basis, one from an income maintenance agency and one from an employment programs agency.

The Steering Committee meets every six weeks and is comprised of the following personnel:

- DHSS Deputy Secretary

- CARES Project Director
- KIDS Project Director
- Division of Economic Support (DES) Administrator
- Division of Management Services (DMS) Administrator
- Division of Community Services (DCS) Administrator
- Division of Health (DOH) Administrator
- Division of State Finance and Program Management Administrator

A management committee meets monthly to review and coordinate the participation of State staff. It is comprised of the following personnel:

- CARES Project Director
- CARES Project Manager
- CARES Technical Manager
- DES Deputy Administrator
- DMS Deputy Administrator
- DCS Deputy Administrator
- DOH Bureau of Health Care Financing Director
- DES Office of Welfare Initiatives Director
- DES Bureau of Management and Operations Director
- DES Bureau of Employment and Program Operations Director
- DES Office of Inspector General Director
- DMS Bureau of Information Systems Director
- DOA/BITM Director
- DOA/BITM CARES Liaison
- DOA/DITS Administrator

The Division of Health's interest in the CARES system is primarily in the interface to the Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) and the data supplied to Wisconsin's Medical Assistance Fiscal Agent.

Additional staff from State program areas were assigned to the project to assist during the requirements definition and acceptance testing phases.

Local agency participation included 55 local agency representatives who took part in requirements meetings. Approximately 45 local agency representatives will be involved in user acceptance testing. T he State has established a pool of local agency employees from income maintenance and employment programs agencies. These staff include eligibility workers, clerical support, managers, supervisors, and training officers. The function of this pool of local-level employees is to contribute, as needed, during the various phases of the project.

All local-level employees remain in that status with salaries and expenses reimbursed to the local agency by the State.

4.6 FSP Participation

FSP participation, in the nature of State-level DES staff and local level caseworkers, has been constant since the planning phase of the CARES Project. It has remained that way through development and is expected to continue at that high, or a higher, level during implementation.

4.7 MIS Participation

The CARES project team is well integrated and shows a cross section of the impacted units within the organization. MIS is represented at all levels of the project.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

During the current development phase, the only identified problem area was in obtaining system documentation from Florida prior to the execution of the contract with Deloitte Touche. The difficulty causing the latest delay in beginning the pilot on time is unknown.

Wisconsin has expressed concern, however, regarding the change in local agency work functions caused by changing from a system oriented towards data entry operators to one in which caseworkers directly input data.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

Wisconsin's present system, CRN-IMP, was developed by the State and does not seem like a viable transfer candidate due to its age and limited functionality. The new CARES system being transferred from Florida is still under development; it is too early to assess its transferability.

The use of CASE tools and the change from an IMS to DB2 database are technical innovations in the field of FAMIS systems and may make Wisconsin's CARES more attractive to States which are moving in this direction technically. Key technical areas relating to future transferability will include the success of the DB2 database rewrite and the system's ability to process large amounts of data efficiently.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

The following section provides a description of the CARES system. The description includes a profile of system hardware and a discussion of the system operating environment.

6.1　System Profile

The components supporting CRN-IMP are as follows (a detailed listing is contained in Exhibit A-6.1, Appendix A):

- **Mainframe:**　　　　　　Hitachi GX8320
　　　　　　　　　　　　MVS/ESA, CICS, IMS, DB2, ACF2

- **Disk:**　　　　　　　　IBM 3380
　　　　　　　　　　　　Hitachi 7380/7390

- **Solid State:**　　　　　Hitachi 7990

- **Tape:**　　　　　　　　IBM 3420/3480

- **Printers:**　　　　　　IBM 3835 Laser
　　　　　　　　　　　　IBM 4245 Impact

- **Front Ends:**　　　　　IBM 3745
　　　　　　　　　　　　Amdahl 4745

- **Workstations:**　　　　Memorex 3270-type

- **Telecommunications:**　SNA/ACF/VTAM T1 backbone with 4 major nodes; 9.6 and 56 KB circuits multi-dropped from each node

6.2　Description of Operating Environment

This section contains a description of the current operating system environment, including maintenance, telecommunications, performance, response time, and downtime. There also is a discussion of the plans for the future of the system.

6.2.1　Operating Environment

The Wisconsin Department of Administration (DOA) operates a consolidated data center for all State agencies. Prior to 1989, there were five regional data centers that supported individual agencies. To reduce duplication and use resources more efficiently, the State legislature required that they be consolidated. Efforts to bring all applications into the consolidated center were completed in July 1992.

Two systems, an Amdahl 5995 and an Hitachi GX8320, provide both production and testing support to Wisconsin agencies. The Amdahl provides 204 MIPS of processing power, while the Hitachi currently is rated at 135 million instructions per second (MIPS). The peripherals supported include both IBM and Hitachi 3380 and 3390 type direct access storage device (DASD), IBM 3420 and 3480 tape units, IBM and Amdahl 3745 Front End

Processors, and distributed printer support. All former regional data centers retained their printing capability and are connected to the DOA facility through fiber optic channel extenders in the Madison metropolitan area. Only two printers are installed in the DOA data center for local printing only.

An uninterruptible power system (UPS) is installed and is tested quarterly. Batteries provide from 15 to 30 minutes of immediate support, and a diesel generator is on site to provide full electrical support for extended outages.

Disaster recovery support is currently being tested for selected applications. Wisconsin has a contract with Comdisco for a hot site backup arrangement and has access to the former regional data center space for cold site requirements, if needed.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

The Division of Information Technology Services (Info Tech) provides a 7 day, 24 hour environment that supports eight domains (Amdahl) or LPARs (Hitachi): five production, two test, and one network control. A staff of 95 provides support for the operational environment: 36 work in computer operations and operations support; 8 in customer service; 6 in network control; and 45 in systems programming, database management and other system support roles.

System maintenance is performed weekly on Sunday mornings from 5:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. All preventative maintenance, software enhancements, and other support activity is scheduled for this time frame. Modifications (hardware and software) are scheduled through a change control committee that meets at least monthly. Changes are requested through a formal work request form which is reviewed and approved by the user department and systems before it is submitted for evaluation. Once resources and a schedule are established, the modification is developed, tested, and implemented.

Incremental backups are conducted every day both within the application batch process, and, for selected critical files, by the data center staff. Full backups are conducted on weekends.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

In 1988, Wisconsin decided to replace all of the existing data networks with a consolidated data network (CDN). By 1989 the five regional networks had all been replaced by the new statewide backbone. Later, the Wisconsin Lottery network was absorbed under the backbone leaving only the University of Wisconsin network outside of the CDN. The network consists of four regional nodes (LATAs) located in Madison, Waukesha, Appleton, and Eau Claire. These nodes are connected by multiple AT&T T1 circuits. There are ten primary T1s connecting the nodes together. There are also 10 to 15 subsidiary T1s dropped from each node to handle those tail circuits that carry a substantial volume of transactions. Each T1 circuit is supported by an AT&T Data Kit

which allows each circuit to support a variety of protocols. Currently SNA, Burroughs Poll Select, DEC DDCMP, and HDLC (LAN support) are handled by the network.

All node locations are within an AT&T central office. All maintenance activity and service for Wisconsin network changes is performed by AT&T. In Madison, there is also a fiber optic network used to connect local agency offices to the node.

From each of the node locations, a number of 9.6 and 56 KB tail circuits are multi-dropped to the local offices. The speed of the circuit is based on the volume of transactions supported. As the volume grows, circuit speed is increased. In some remote areas that do not yet support 56 KB service, an upgrade to 19.2 is provided. The Wisconsin Lottery utilizes 2.4 KB circuits for its terminals. There are approximately 500 circuits being supported on the CDN with another 150 supporting the lottery system.

Front End Processors are located at each node. Currently, there are five units, three IBM 3745s and two Amdahl 4745s, in service.

6.2.4 System Performance

Both processors are used to handle both production and test workloads. The Hitachi system currently houses the public assistance production system and runs at about 83 percent average utilization during the first shift. The Amdahl processor averages about 65 percent utilization during the first shift. There appears to be adequate disk and tape processing capacity for all applications with the majority of tape processing being handled by cartridges. Of the current tape library of 150,000 volumes, only 2,000 are tape reels.

When the regional data centers were consolidated into the one centralized complex in 1992, printing facilities were left in the regional data centers, supported by the local agency staff. Printers are connected to the Info Tech data center via bus and tag cable channel extenders and Beall fiber optic channel extenders. The printers operate as if they were locally attached to the CPU. The printers housed at the Info Tech data center support only those printouts for local staff use.

6.2.5 System Response

While no specific response time measurements for local office terminals are recorded, the performance goal for Wisconsin is to have no more than one second of processing within the mainframe, and no more than two seconds of delay within the network. Any consistent performance delays beyond two seconds on the network would initiate a review of the network configuration/line speed to determine the most effective way to improve performance. Neither the food stamp operations staff nor the system staff felt that there were any response time problems within the statewide network. Actions are being undertaken to upgrade the Hitachi processor to alleviate the processing bottleneck developing due to cycle constraints.

6.2.6 System Downtime

System availability was found to be above 99.5 percent. There were no apparent issues with the food stamp operations personnel that reflected poor service levels from the Info Tech area. Most of the problems during the past year were small application issues that did not affect the total system. The UPS system is tested quarterly to insure that it will be ready when needed.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

An upgrade to the Hitachi, from a GX 8320 to a GX 8420, will be accomplished in the near future. This will increase the processing power by 50 percent.

System managed storage (SMS) software is being implemented. It is estimated that over the next two years, all applications will be migrated under the SMS software to provide the most effective storage media for files.

The use of Storage Tek Silo technology will be evaluated as the SMS project begins to identify the storage need of the data center. No concrete plans or timeframes have been established.

Continued work will be undertaken to test and refine the disaster recovery plan for Wisconsin. While only a few of the critical applications are actively being tested, more will be added to the process until the full plan has been implemented.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses the following areas: CARES development costs and approved Federal funding, operating costs currently charged to FNS for FSP processing, and cost allocation methodologies applied to allocating CARES development and CRN-IMP operating costs.

7.1 CARES Development Costs and Federal Funding

The May 1991 projected costs of CARES was $37.8 million; the FNS share was 30.66 percent, or $11.6 million. By March 1993, the budget had increased to $39.6 million; the FNS share is $11.8 million, or 29.7 percent.[5] As of March 31, 1993, $5.21 million had been expended for CARES development.[6]

CARES was initiated as a redesign and technology upgrade to CRN-IMP. A Planning APD (PAPD) was submitted to the Federal funding agencies in November 1988. FNS approved the PAPD in January 1989 for $292,376, at a 39.55 percent share, or $115,635;

---

[5] The budget increase included $719,000 in additional funding for support of Title IV-F functionality.

[6] Cost Allocation Interview Guide and Survey, p.6.

the Federal financial participation (FFP) was 50 percent. The FFP was increased to 75 percent retroactive to January 1, 1989.

An Implementation APD (IAPD) was prepared in August 1989. The IAPD became an extension of the PAPD, and, as such, was approved by FNS in August 1989. FNS also approved an increase in the planning budget of $924,227, an FNS share of 39.55 percent, or $365,532, to be reimbursed at a 75 percent FFP, or $274,149.[7] The period covered in this approval ran from August 2, 1989 through June 30, 1990.

The RFP for the transfer contractor was issued on February 16, 1990. The planning phase was once again extended to February 28, 1991 to accommodate the delayed start of the development phase. The responses to the RFP were evaluated from May 1990 through June 1990. The Letter of Intent to Award was issued on August 20, 1990. In January 1991, the planning phase was extended to June 30, 1991 to accommodate contract negotiations. Negotiations with the transfer contractor continued from January 1991 through May 1991. As of March 31, 1991, $938,355 had been expended for CARES planning activities.[8] Actual planning costs incurred after March 31, 1991 were unavailable.

An IAPD dated May 1991 was submitted to the Federal funding agencies for approval in April 1991. DHHS and FNS approved the IAPD in June 1991 and August 1991, respectively. All July and August costs were funded by FNS under the PAPD; all costs for that same period were funded by DHHS through the IAPD. Beginning September 1991, all CARES costs were funded through the IAPD.

The start of the development phase was again delayed, to October 1, 1991. The causes of this delay were:

- The contract to be awarded to the transfer contractor had not been signed.

- Once the contract was signed, the transfer contractor could not initiate Milestone 1 because the availability of the software supporting the Florida transfer system was delayed.

The start of the development phase was delayed to January 2, 1992, which became the official start date for the development phase. On that day the transfer contractor began work on Milestone 1. Based on a delayed start date of January 2, 1992, the statewide implementation end date was rescheduled to March 31, 1995; the project end date was rescheduled to March 31, 1996.

---

[7] APD, p. III-5.

[8] IAPD, p. III-5, states that planning costs incurred through August 1989 were $163,037; costs incurred through from August 1989 through March 1991 were an additional $775,318.

7.1.1 CARES System Components

CARES is designed to be a fully integrated eligibility determination and management information system which meets the requirements of FAMIS, the Food and Nutrition Service, and Wisconsin. A single data collection process will be used for AFDC, Medicaid, and FSP. The system will be certifiable by the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), the Administration for Children and Families, and the Food and Nutrition Service.[9] CARES does not support any State-only programs.

7.1.2 Major CARES Development Cost Components

Table 7.1, CARES Cost Components, presents the CARES budget as of March 22, 1993. The budget includes all CARES expenditures projected into Federal fiscal year (FFY) 1996. The table shows that the major costs for CARES development are for contractor support (78 percent), hardware (9 percent), and State personnel (12 percent). Each of these components is addressed in the sections below.

The FNS share of this budget is presented in Table 7.2, FNS Share of CARES Budget. This table shows that FNS will reimburse Wisconsin $7.41 million for CARES development and implementation.

7.1.2.1 Hardware

An earlier upgrade to the hardware system supporting the CRN-IMP system reduced the amount of hardware that had to be purchased for the CARES system.[10] As of March 1993, the additional hardware required by CARES was projected to cost $3.44 million. The hardware includes:

- Terminals: 860 new or replacement terminals for income maintenance activity conducted in local agencies; 299 terminals for JOBS agencies; personal computers to support CASE development. Estimated cost: $1.21 million.

- Printers, estimated cost: $1.92 million.

- Controllers, estimated cost: $0.25 million.

- Site installation and line drops, estimated cost: $0.06 million.

Depreciation charges as of March 1993 totalled $160,067.

---

[9] IAPD, May 1991, p. VI-5.

[10] Per 2/6/89 letter: FNS approved $412,000 at 50 percent FFP, or $206,000 for income maintenance hardware; FNS approved $83,356 for personal computers; FNS approved $125,000, at 50 percent FFP, or $62,521, for hardware to be used by the Division of Community Services Staff in the administration of AFDC, FSP, and Medical Assistance.

Table 7.1   CARES Cost Components

CARES COST COMPONENTS	3/93 APDU BUDGET $	% OF TOTAL BUDGETED COST
Direct State Personnel	4,809,416	12.14%
Indirect State Personnel	31,875	0.08%
Deloitte Touche	19,298,424	48.71%
EMS, Inc.	1,179,500	2.98%
State CDP Facilities	10,327,680	26.07%
Total Contractors	30,805,604	77.75%
Purchase/Lease Hardware	3,437,400	8.68%
Purchase/Lease Software	110,355	0.28%
ADP Supplies	0	0%
Miscellaneous ADP Expenses	203,040	0.51%
Training Costs	125,703	0.32%
Indirect Costs	0	0%
Total Computable for Federal Funding	$39,523,393	99.75%
Additional DHHS/ACF & HCFA[11] (7/1/91 - 8/31/91)	98,030	0.25%
Total CARES Budget 3/22/93	$39,621,423	100%

---

[11] This amount is shown separately to accommodate the FNS request to have the implementation budget reflect the USDA/FNS approval data of August 30, 1991. Because DHHS/ACF approved the IAPD effective July 1, 1991, these additional costs will be claimed under the IAPD for the interim period.

Table 7.2   FNS Share of CARES Budget

CARES COSTS	TOTAL	FNS SHARE		FNS FFP	
		%	$	%	$
System Development	$36,085,993	31.34%	$11,310,072	63%	$7,125,345
Hardware	$3,437,400	13.499%	$464,015	50%	$292,329
Total	$39,523,393	29.79%	$11,774,087	-	$7,417,674

7.1.2.2   Contractor Costs

Two outside companies are supporting the CARES development effort:

- *Deloitte Touche* was awarded a fixed-price contract valued at $19.3 million in November 1991. The period of performance equals 30 months. As of March 31, 1993, $2,562,561 had been expended against

to be $1,179,500. As of March 31, 1993, $548,600 had been paid to EMS, Inc. for CARES activities.[14]

7.1.2.3 State Personnel Cost

Costs for State personnel will be charged both directly and indirectly to the CARES development project. Direct charges will be for staff working directly on CARES development activities and will include salary, fringe benefits, and related costs. The projected amount of direct charges for State personnel is $4.8 million, more than 12 percent of the total development budget. Indirect charges will be for Departmental employees working in departments that support the CARES development effort. The projected cost for this support is $32,000 over the life of the development project. Actual costs expended to date were unavailable.

7.1.2.4 State CDP Facility

The CARES project has contracted with the State CDP facility for mainframe computer support, disk space, telecommunications support, and other technical support. The contract specifies rates for each item of support. These costs, projected at $10.3 million, are billed to the project directly. These costs do not include the costs charged to Deloitte and Touche for use of the State CDP facility services during the development stage of the project. The cost to the CARES project to date for support from this contractor was unavailable.

7.2 Food Stamp Program Operational Costs

The annual costs for FSP operations charged to FNS via SF-269 are presented in Table 7.3, Current Operating Costs. The table shows that the annual costs charged to FNS includes two large cost components besides that for CRN-IMP system operations (CRN Operations - Non-salary). These components are:

- *Food Stamp Machine*, which includes costs for processing the coupons, stuffing the coupons in the envelopes, and addressing the envelopes.

- *Food Stamp Particle*, which includes direct costs for Project 603 which provides benefit history for unused stamps and client tracking for over-issued food stamps.

These two components, in addition to CRN Case Related Activity, routinely comprise the quarterly operating costs charged to FNS.

---

[14] Ibid.

Table 7.3 Current Operating Costs

OPERATIONS COST COMPONENT	FFY 1990	FFY 1991	FFY 1992	FFY 1993 (2 qtrs)
Food Stamp Machine (D)	786,379	847,222	1,092,781	427,844
CRN Case Related Activity (A)	5,325	5,389	7,174	4,751
Food Stamp Particle (D)	127,304	230,092	259,661	81,036
CRN Operations - Non-salary (A)	832,162	1,002,234	1,518,246	858,416
Admin Hearings - Hardware	10,674	1,850	0	0
Redesign	75	0	0	0
Total SF-269 ADP OPR	**$1,761,919**	**$2,086,787**	**$2,877,862**	**$1,372,047**
% Attributable to CRN Operations	47%	48%	53%	63%

(D) - Direct charge to FNS operations   (A) - Allocated to FNS operations

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

The FSP share of CARES annual operating costs for 1992 was $1,518,246 (this cost includes only the CRN Operations - non-salary category of charges). The FNS share of CARES monthly cost was thus $126,520. The cost per case -- based on the monthly participation of 131,136 food stamp households -- was $0.96.

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

The Office of Information Systems (OIS) is part of the Division of Management Services. OIS assists other departmental units in automation planning efforts and responds to information system development and data processing needs. This office identifies and promotes cost efficient automation of business applications throughout the department. It also corrects gaps in data availability, educates departmental managers regarding system/computer applications technology, and advises managers regarding application policies and future system requirements.

The OIS charges users directly for services using billing rates associated with types of services provided. The billing rates are approved by DHHS.

OIS maintains the computer reporting network which currently supports the Income Maintenance Reporting system, predecessor to the CARES. The methodology used to distribute the costs of operating this network among the public assistance programs supported is described in the following section.

7.3 Wisconsin Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section describes the methodology used to allocate CARES development costs to the Food Stamp Program. It then describes the methodology currently in use for allocating the costs of the CRN-IMP to the Food Stamp Program.

7.3.1 Overview of CARES Development Cost Allocation Methodology

CARES cost allocation methodology splits costs into hardware and all other development costs. Table 7.4, CARES Cost Allocation, presents the currently approved allocation percentages. These ratios will be held constant throughout the entire budget period of the most recent IAPD, July 1, 1991 through December 31, 1995, unless significant Federal or State legislation requires a change in the scope of the project which impacts a particular program or programs so as to warrant changes to the cost allocation plan.[15]

The methodology for allocating costs in those percentages is addressed below.

7.3.1.1 CARES Development Exclusive of Hardware

The methodology for deriving direct or distributed costs for the project exclusive of hardware was based on a comprehensive analysis of the business requirements identified in the CARES RFP. Each system function within each subsystem was examined to identify which Public Assistance Program(s) benefitted from the automation of that function. The cost of automating a function supporting a single program is direct charged to that program.

Table 7.4 CARES Cost Allocation

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	DEVELOPMENT/ NO HARDWARE	HARDWARE
Title IV-A, AFDC	41.768%	49.506%
Title IV-F, JOBS	5.587%	20.917%
Title XIX, Medical Assistance only	21.303%	16.078%
Food Stamp Program	31.342%	13.499%
Total	100%	100%

The costs of automating a function that supports more than one program were further analyzed to determine the proportion of support provided to each program

---

[15] IAPD, p. XI-5.

by the automated function. For some functions, the proportionate share was set based on the proportion of cases supported by each program associated with each function. For those functions in which the caseload proportion did not accurately reflect the fair share, the fair share was determined based on a count of specific processes within the function.

The costs of developing the Work Program Subsystem was allocated to AFDC, JOBS, and FSP based on the proportion of recipients on the current caseload who must participate in work program. The split was determined to be: AFDC/JOBS at 70 percent and FSP at 30 percent.

7.3.1.2 CARES Hardware

The hardware cost allocation is based upon an approved cost allocation which uses the recipient count for the January 1991 through March 1991 quarter as the baseline. Following that, the cost of additional hardware specifically purchased to support JOBS was factored in.

7.3.2 CRN-IMP Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics

The CRN-IMP contains joint program costs which are allocated based on the type of activity. The three types of activities and an example of each are:

- Direct program-related activities: Issuance of food stamp identification cards and registers

- Case-related activities: food stamp recipient case review

- Recipient-related activities: Eligibility determination

Each of these types of allocation activities is described below.

7.3.2.1 Direct Program-Related Activities

These types of activities are functions which relate to a single program and are billed directly to the applicable program by billing number. A specific billing number is assigned to each direct program-related activity. The billing number corresponds to a specific program project code in the DHSS accounting system within the Division of Economic Support.

7.3.2.2 Case-Related Activities

These activities are income maintenance functions which require that only certain data elements from the case records need to be reviewed. Case-related activities are income maintenance functions which are charged to a project code in the DHSS accounting system with the DMS or DES.

Income maintenance case-related activities are distributed to AFDC, FSP, and Medical Assistance by means of the following process. Case count data are collected by county agencies as they process client applications. These data are used to allocate the case related activities. The case count data are keyed into the CRN system and reside in an integrated database. Case statistics used in determining the allocation of the CRN costs are extracted from this integrated database. The case statistics are the unduplicated number of cases serviced and eligible for any of the various program combinations. These monthly counts are aggregated in the quarter prior to computing the cost allocation ratios. These statistics represent the activity of the CRN costs pool being allocated to individual programs because they include counts of every case served in each month for each program.

7.3.2.3 Recipient-Related Activities

These activities are functions in which all recipient data files within a case must be reviewed to perform the required function. Costs not identified as direct program-related or case-related are treated as recipient-related activities. Recipient-related activities are charged in the same manner as case-related activities.

The following procedure is used to distribute the CRN-IMP recipient activities to AFDC, Medical Assistance, and the Food Stamp Program. Recipient count data are collected by county agencies as client applications are processed. These data are keyed into the CRN system and reside in an integrated database. The recipient statistics used in determining the allocation of the CRN costs are extracted from this integrated database. The recipient statistics are the unduplicated number of recipients served and eligible for any of the various program combinations. These monthly counts are aggregated quarterly prior to computing the cost allocation ratios. These statistics are representative of the activity of the CRN costs pool being allocated to individual programs because they include counts of every client served in each month for each program.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF WISCONSIN

EXHIBITS

Code	Regulation	Provision	Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
1.1	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	1: Excludes as income State or local GA payments to HHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	N	N	Y
1.2	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	2: Excludes from income annual school clothing allowance however paid. 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)	8/1/91	N	N	Y
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	2/1/92*	N	N	Y
1.4	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	4: State agency shall use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. 273.9(d)(5)(i)	2/1/92*	N	N	Y
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	N	N	Y
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal time frames. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	N	Y	Y
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service time frames. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	N	N	Y

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
3.1	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	N	N	Y
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/89*	N	Y	Y
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	Y	Y	Y
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	N/A	N	N	N
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	Y	N
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	Y	N	Y
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	Y	N	Y

*   These dates were changed after the State completed this form and the site visit occurred; therefore, the responses to these particular regulatory changes may be inaccurate.

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
GX8320	Hitachi	Purchase	128 channels, 512 MB main storage, 512 MB extended storage, 135 MIPS
5995-4550 (CRN-IMP/CARES)	Amdahl	Purchase	128 channels, 768 MB main storage, 1024 expanded storage, 204 MIPS
DASD			
3380/3390	IBM	Purchase	Controllers - 3390 (6) Drives - 3380 (24), 3390 (2)
7380/7390	Hitachi	Purchase	Controllers - 7790 (4) Drives - 7380 (40), 7390 (3)
Solid State	Hitachi	Purchase	7970 - 2
TAPE			
Cartridge Drives	IBM	Purchase	3480 (24)
Tape Reel Drives	IBM	Purchase	3420 (6)
PRINTERS			
Laser	IBM	Purchase	3480 (1)
Impact	IBM	Purchase	4245 (1)
FRONT ENDS			
37XX (installed at regional sites)	IBM	Purchase	3745 (1)
	Amdahl	Purchase	4745 (2)
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
3270 Type	Memorex-Telex	Purchase	2,400 (estimated)

A-4

APPENDIX B

STATE OF WISCONSIN

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey represent the perceptions of eligibility workers (EWs) in Wisconsin. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Wisconsin. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EWs in Wisconsin	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
1,071	63	5.9%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	29	46.0%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of EWs in Wisconsin. The number of responses, however, is low and produces a small sample that may not be representative of the randomly selected group.

Summary of Findings

Overall, respondents generally are satisfied with the computer system in Wisconsin. Most EWs think that the system provides acceptable overall response time, availability, accuracy, and ease of use. Nevertheless, workers' responses indicate that relatively large proportions of EWs experience some difficulty in performing certain functions in the system. Workers feel that the system generally has a positive impact on job satisfaction; nearly 90 percent think that the system is a great help in their jobs.

Since Wisconsin's current system has been operational since the early 1980s, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Good	25	86.2
Excellent	4	13.8

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Poor	8	27.6
Good	19	65.5
Excellent	2	6.9

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	7	24.1
Sometimes	18	62.1
Often	4	13.8

Eligibility workers surveyed think that system response time generally is good. All of EWs feel that overall system response time is good or excellent, and more than 72 percent think response time during peak periods is good or excellent. The majority, however, believes response time sometimes is too slow.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Sometimes	2	6.9
Often	27	93.1

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	15	51.7
Sometimes	13	44.8
Often	1	3.4

More than 93 percent of eligibility workers believe that the system often is available when they need to use it, but almost half of the respondents also think that the system is sometimes or often down. The system downtime, however, does not seem to be intrusive enough to detract from the perception that the system generally is available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Poor	1	3.4
Good	27	93.1
Excellent	1	3.4

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	23	79.3
Sometimes	6	20.7

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	17	58.6
Sometimes	12	41.4

How often is the system's data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	22	75.9
Sometimes	7	24.1

Most eligibility workers think the system's data and computations are accurate. Nearly 97 percent of the workers feel that the quality of the information in the system is good or excellent. More than three quarters of the EWs also believe that problems related to cases terminated in error and obsolete data are rare, but a significant minority feels that eligibility sometimes is determined incorrectly.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	18	62.1
Sometimes	11	37.9

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	26	89.7
Sometimes	3	10.3

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	22	75.9
Sometimes	7	24.1

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	23	79.3
Sometimes	6	20.7

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	23	79.3
Sometimes	5	17.2
Often	1	3.4

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	22	78.6
Sometimes	4	14.3
Often	2	7.1

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	21	77.8
Sometimes	5	18.5
Often	1	3.7

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	20	69.0
Sometimes	9	31.0

How often do you have difficulty identifying recipients already known to the State?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	15	53.6
Sometimes	11	39.3
Often	2	7.1

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	18	72.0
Sometimes	6	24.0
Often	1	4.0

How often do you have difficulty updating eligibility and benefit information from recertification data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	22	78.6
Sometimes	6	21.4

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases which are overdue for recertification?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	15	57.7
Sometimes	10	38.5
Often	1	3.8

How often do you have difficulty monitoring the status of all hearings?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	11	52.4
Sometimes	5	23.8
Often	5	23.8

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	11	47.8
Sometimes	7	30.4
Often	5	21.7

How often do you have difficulty automatically notifying households of case actions?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	24	82.8
Sometimes	5	17.2

How often do you have difficulty notifying recipients that recertification is required?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	20	74.1
Sometimes	7	25.9

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases making payments through recoupment?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	17	60.7
Sometimes	7	25.0
Often	4	14.3

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	11	47.8
Sometimes	10	43.5
Often	2	8.7

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases involving suspected fraud?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	8	38.1
Sometimes	10	47.6
Often	3	14.3

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	19	82.6
Often	4	17.4

Eligibility workers generally believe that the system is easy to use. For most functions, a large majority reports rarely having difficulty. There are several areas, however, in which more than half of responding EWs sometimes or often have difficulty. These areas include: tracking outstanding verifications, identifying error prone cases, and identifying cases involving suspected fraud. In addition, significant minorities sometimes or often have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system, identifying recipients already known to the State, identifying cases overdue for recertification, monitoring the status of hearings, and identifying cases making payments through recoupment.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Sometimes	3	10.3
Often	26	89.7

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	16	55.2
Sometimes	13	44.8

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	19	70.4
Sometimes	8	29.6

Although most EWs experience few problems in providing expedited service to clients, a significant minority believes it sometimes is difficult to achieve expedited service.

Fraud and Errors

No data are available to address fraud and errors with the Wisconsin system because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Wisconsin's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF WISCONSIN

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility worker (EW) supervisors in Wisconsin. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in the State. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the managers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EW Supervisors in Wisconsin	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
137	30	21.9%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	12	40.0%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of supervisors in Wisconsin. The total number of respondents, however, is low. The low response rate produces a small sample whose responses may not be representative of this random selection.

Summary of Findings

EW supervisors in Wisconsin generally regard the system positively. Most supervisors think that system response time, availability, accuracy, and ease of use generally are good. The majority of respondents also feels that the system contributes to job satisfaction and adequately supports management needs. All of the responding EW supervisors believe that the system is a great help in their jobs.

Since Wisconsin's current system has been operational since the early 1980s, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative *questions*, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	9	75.0
Excellent	3	25.0

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	3	25.0
Good	6	50.0
Excellent	3	25.0

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	41.7
Sometimes	6	50.0
Often	1	8.3

EW supervisors in Wisconsin are satisfied with system response time. All of the respondents feel that overall system response time is good or excellent, and three quarters of the supervisors think response time is good or excellent during peak processing periods.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Often	12	100.0

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	41.7
Sometimes	6	50.0
Often	1	8.3

Supervisors in Wisconsin are generally pleased with system availability. All responding EW supervisors report that the system often is available when they need to use it, but half of the supervisors feel the system sometimes is down. This downtime, however, apparently is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception of overall system availability.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	9	75.0
Excellent	3	25.0

All of the responding EW supervisors think that the quality of the system's data is good or excellent.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	66.7
Sometimes	3	25.0
Often	1	8.3

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	66.7
Sometimes	3	25.0
Often	1	8.3

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	63.6
Sometimes	4	36.4

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	75.0
Sometimes	3	25.0

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	66.7
Sometimes	2	16.7
Often	2	16.7

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	55.6
Sometimes	3	33.3
Often	1	11.1

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	10	83.3
Sometimes	2	16.7

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	80.0
Sometimes	2	20.0

EW supervisors generally feel that the system is easy to use. For each specific function, a majority reports rarely having difficulty with the task. The two areas in which the largest minorities report sometimes or often experiencing difficulty involve: tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms (36 percent) and generating warning notices (44 percent).

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Often	12	100.0

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	33.3
Sometimes	7	58.3
Often	1	8.3

EW supervisors generally feel that the system contributes to job satisfaction. All respondents believe that the system often is a great help in their jobs; however, two thirds of the EW supervisors also think it sometimes or often creates added stress.

Management Needs

What is the quality of the reports produced by the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	2	16.7
Good	7	58.3
Excellent	3	25.0

What is the quality of the support provided by the technical staff supporting the automated system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	9	75.0
Excellent	3	25.0

How often do you have difficulty making mass changes to the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	57.1
Sometimes	2	28.6
Often	1	14.3

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	70.0
Sometimes	3	30.0

Most EW supervisors think that the system does a good job in supporting management needs. All responding supervisors feel that the quality of technical staff support is good or excellent. More than 83 percent of respondents think that the reports produced by the system are good or excellent. Majorities also report rarely having difficulties making mass changes and meeting Federal reporting requirements.

Client Service

No data are available to address client service because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Wisconsin's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

Fraud and Errors

No data are available to address fraud and errors with the Wisconsin system because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Wisconsin's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.